



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,943	07/25/2003	Joseph T. Rubino	AM-100802	3231
38199	7590	03/18/2009	EXAMINER	
HOWSON & HOWSON LLP / WYETH 501 OFFICE CENTER DRIVE SUITE 210 FORT WASHINGTON, PA 19034			POLANSKY, GREGG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/626,943	Applicant(s) RUBINO ET AL.	
	Examiner GREGG POLANSKY	Art Unit 1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16, 18 and 31-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16, 18 and 31-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/02/2008</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicants' response, filed 12/02/2008, to the Office Action mailed 9/04/2008 is acknowledged. Applicants amended Claims 13-16, 18, 31, and 35, canceled Claims 17 and 19-21, added Claims 38 and 39, and presented arguments in response to the Office Action.
2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 12/02/2008, is acknowledged and has been reviewed.
3. Claims 12-16, 18, and 31-39 are pending and presently under consideration.
4. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 38 recites "A parenteral formulation which comprises about 10 mg/mL to about 25 mg/mL rapamycin 42-ester with 3-hydroxy-2-(hydroxymethyl)-2-methylproprionic acid (CCI-779), dehydrated ethanol; 0.001% to 0.5% w/v of an antioxidant comprising α -tocopherol; a diluent solvent comprising polyethylene glycol, and about 0.5% to about 10% w/v surfactant comprising polysorbate 80." According to the placement of commas and semicolons in the claim, it appears that the concentration of CCI-779 (i.e., 10 mg/mL to 25 mg/mL) is with regard to the dehydrated ethanol alone.

Claim 38 recites "A parenteral formulation which comprises about 10 mg/mL to about 25 mg/mL rapamycin 42-ester with 3-hydroxy-2-(hydroxymethyl)-2-methylproprionic acid (CCI-779), dehydrated ethanol; 0.001% to 0.5% w/v of an antioxidant comprising α -tocopherol; a diluent solvent comprising polyethylene glycol, and about 0.5% to about 10% w/v surfactant comprising polysorbate 80." According to the placement of commas and semicolons in the claim, it is unclear whether the CCI-779 concentration recited is with regard to the ethanol alone or to the entire formulation, including the diluent. Therefore, the claim is considered to be indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1611

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 12-16, 18, and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skotnicki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,362,718), in view of Waranis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,516,770) and Haeberlin et al. (UK Patent Application Publication GB 2327611).

Skotnicki et al. teach hydroxyester derivatives of rapamycin, including the instantly claimed CCI-779 (rapamycin 42-ester with 3-hydroxy-2-(hydroxymethyl)-2-methylpropionic acid), and that these derivatives are useful as immunosuppressive, anti-inflammatory, antifungal, antiproliferative, and antitumor agents. See column 1, 1st paragraph and last paragraph, and column 12, "EXAMPLE 9". The reference suggests the rapamycin derivatives can be formulated with suitable carriers, including alcoholic solvents, and excipients for *inter alia* oral or parenteral administration. See columns 7 and 8.

Skotnicki et al. do not teach the formulations of CCI-779 recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1611

Waranis et al. teach an injectable rapamycin solution comprised of a mixture of a concentrate of rapamycin in propylene glycol with a diluent of polyethylene glycol 400 and a polyoxyethylene sorbitan ester (e.g., polysorbate 80) and water (see Examples 1-3), yielding an injectable formulation concentration of rapamycin of 0.2 mg/ml to 4 mg/ml (see column 2, lines 44-47), with 0.07-9.5% polysorbate 80 and 12-87% glycols (see column 3, lines 29-54). These concentrations are within the concentration ranges specified in the claims of the instant application.

Waranis et al. do not teach use of an antioxidant. Waranis et al. teach formulations of rapamycins, but not CCI-779 specifically. Waranis et al do not teach a formulation comprising ethanol (recited by instant Claims 32 and 38) or vitamin E (d,l- α -tocopherol) (recited by instant Claims 33, 34, 36, 38 and 39).

Haeberlin et al. teach the use of various carboxylic acids to stabilize (i.e., preserve) oral and parenteral formulations of macrolides, preferably a rapamycin. The reference teaches that macrolides [note: this would include CCI-779] are unstable upon storage, undergoing a variety of different degradation reactions and an acidic environment inhibits the degradation. See page 3. The preferred acids include malonic acid, oxalic acid, citric acid, and lactic acid (see page 4, lines 15-22). Haeberlin et al. teach a 0.05% to 5% acid concentration range and further disclose that the preferred amount of acid may be determined by routine experimentation. Haeberlin et al. give as an example, a formulation of a rapamycin with absolute (dehydrated) ethanol, Cremophor[®] EL (a surfactant), and citric acid. They present other examples of

Art Unit: 1611

rapamycin formulations which include the use of 1,2 propylene glycol as a solvent and d,l- α -tocopherol (vitamin E) as an antioxidant. See pages 5-7.

With respect to claimed concentration ranges in the instant compositions, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation when general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art. See *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1955) and MPEP 2144.05(11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, who was motivated to produce parenteral formulations of rapamycins, including CCI-779, to combine the teachings of Skotnicki et al., which discloses hydroxyester rapamycin derivatives and formulations thereof, with those of Waranis et al. and Haeberlin et al., which teach rapamycin formulations. Waranis et al. teach the concentrations of the solvents (e.g., propylene glycol, absolute ethanol, and polyethylene glycol 400), rapamycin, and a specific surfactant (polysorbate 80) for a parenteral rapamycin formulation. Haeberlin et al. teach the instability of rapamycins and the need to use citric acid and d,l- α -tocopherol as a stabilizer in a rapamycin parenteral formulation. This would have motivated one to include citric acid/d,l- α -tocopherol in the formulations taught by the other two references. Since Skotnicki et al. do not teach specific formulations, one would have been motivated to find art teaching specific formulations of rapamycins, including CCI-779, such as is taught by Waranis et al. and Haeberlin et al. One would have been motivated to perfect a parental formulation of CCI-779 to reduce the bioavailability uncertainties of other forms of

Art Unit: 1611

administration (e.g., oral), leading to more accurate and reproducible doses of the agent.

Applicants repeat their argument “[t]here is no teaching in the art of any problems associated with CCI-779 parenteral formulations much less the specific problems recognized by the invention. In the absence of recognition of the problem in the art, there can be no motivation in the art to look for a solution”.

This argument is not convincing. Applicants’ attention is again directed to the Haeberlin et al. reference, which teaches that macrolides (which the reference discloses include rapamycin and rapamycin derivatives) are unstable upon storage, and disclose formulations with *inter alia* citric acid and d,l- α -tocopherol to rectify this problem (*supra*). Thus, Haeberlin et al. provides motivation to combine the prior art relied upon in the rejection.

Applicants argue Skotnicki et al. “describes hydroxyesters derivatives of rapamycin, including CCI-779 [but] there is no teaching in Skotnicki et al. which would lead one to select CCI-779 from amongst the other hydroxyesters of rapamycin”.

The Examiner disagrees. CCI-779 is one of the compounds claimed in the invention of Skotnicki et al. See claim 13. This would have provided ample motivation to select CCI-779 from the reference.

Finally, Applicants argue Haeberlin et al. do not describe the use of α -tocopherol as an antioxidant.

As presented *supra*, Haeberlin et al. teach rapamycin formulations with d,l- α -tocopherol. See page 6. Although the reference doesn't disclose d,l- α -tocopherol is an antioxidant, it inherently has this characteristic.

Further, one of skill in the art would have recognized d,l- α -tocopherol to be an antioxidant.

Conclusion

10. Claims 12-16, 18, and 31-39 are rejected.
11. No claims are allowed.
12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1611

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGG POLANSKY whose telephone number is (571)272-9070. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30 A.M. - 7:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila G. Landau can be reached on (571) 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregg Polansky/
Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614